

## **REMARKS**

Claims 24 and 25 are amended and claims 24-30 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks and the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,742,772 to Sreenan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,791 to Wrabetz, et al. (hereinafter “Wrabetz”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

### **The Claims**

**Independent claim 24** is amended, and as amended recites in a computer system having resources and a resource planner for granting reservations of amounts of resources to activities, a computer-implemented method comprising [added language is indicated in underline]:

- submitting a request for a reservation of a set of resources in specified amounts from an activity to the resource planner;
- determining at the resource planner that the request may not be granted;
- returning from the resource planner to the activity a list, the list including an amount of each resource in a set of resources that is currently available to the activity, the amount being specified in terms of units specific to each resource in the set of resources;

- using the returned list at the activity to reformulate the request for a reservation of the set of resources to specify new requested amounts;
- resubmitting the reformulated request to the resource planner; and
- executing the activity.

The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 24 is obvious over Sreenan in view of Wrabetz. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, Applicant has nonetheless amended the claim to further clarify its subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 24 for allegedly being obvious over Sreenan in view of Wrabetz fails for at least the reason that the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 24.

Specifically, Applicant submits that Wrabetz fails to disclose or suggest the feature of:

- returning from the resource planner to the activity a list, the list including an amount of each resource in a set of resources that is currently available to the activity, the amounts being specified in terms of units specific to each resource in the set of resources.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner cited to Wrabetz at column 16, lines 25-50 (approximately) as allegedly discussing a “list of amounts of resources.” However, Wrabetz simply discusses “creat[ing] a list of all of the resources that match the requested resource type” (column 16, lines 37-38, emphasis added). Nowhere does Wrabetz disclose or suggest the above-mentioned feature, particularly with respect to the amounts [of resources] being

specified in terms of units specific to each resource in the set of resources. This feature is not found in either Wrabetz or Sreenan. For further discussion of this feature, the Office is directed to Applicant's specification at, among other places, page 9, line 26, through page 10, line 4, and page 12, line 43, through page 13, line 5.

Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 24 cannot be established based on this combination of references and this claim is allowable.

**Independent claim 25** is amended, and as amended recites in a computer system having resources and a resource planner for granting reservations of amounts of resources to activities performed on the computer system, a computer-implemented method comprising [added language is indicated in underline]:

- negotiating between the resource planner and activities to reserve shares of the resources with the resource planner on behalf of the activities;
- in view of changing resource usage or requirements, renegotiating between the resource planner and the activities to change reservations of resources on behalf of the activities to reflect the changing resource usage or requirements, wherein renegotiating includes returning from the resource planner to the activity a list, the list including an amount of each resource in a set of resources that is currently available to the activity, the amount being specified in terms of units specific to each resource in the set of resources; and
- executing at least one of the activities.

The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 25 is obvious over Sreenan in view of Wrabetz. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with this

rejection, Applicant has nonetheless amended the claim to further clarify its subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 25 for allegedly being obvious over Sreenan in view of Wrabetz fails for at least the reason that the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 25.

Specifically, neither reference discloses or suggests the feature of a list including an amount of each resource in a set of resources that is currently available to the activity, the amount being specified in terms of units specific to each resource in the set of resources. As discussed above, Wrabetz simply discusses a list of resources that match a requested resource type.

Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 25 cannot be established based on this combination of references and this claim is allowable.

**Claims 26-30** depend from claim 25 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 25, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

### **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Dated: September 13, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,

By:



David W. Foster  
Reg. No. 60,902  
(509) 324-9256 ex. 219